

COMMITTEE TO ADVISE ON PERFORMANCE FUNDING AND ASSESSMENT (CAPA)
Advisory Committee to Planning, Assessment And Performance Funding Committee

MINUTES OF JUNE 14, 2002

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
Large Conference Room

Members Present

Institutional Affiliation in ()

Mr. David B. Fleming (Clemson)
Dr. Thomas B. Higerd (MUSC)
Dr. David Hunter (USC, Regional Campuses)
Ms. Karen C. Jones (Winthrop)
Ms. Dorcas Kitchings (Midlands Tech)
Dr. Harry Matthews (USC Columbia)
Ms. Chris Mee (Coastal Carolina)
Mr. Bob Mellon (S.B.T.C.E)
Dr. Spike Metts (Citadel)
Ms. Michelle Smith (College of Charleston)
Dr. Rita Teal (SC State)
Mr. Jonathan Trail (USC Spartanburg)

CHE Staff Present

Ms. Camille Brown
Ms. Saundra Carr
Dr. David Loope
Dr. Michael Raley
Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong
Ms. Julie Wahl

Guests Present

Institutional Affiliation in ()

Dr. James E. Gilbert (MUSC)
Dr. Mary Gunn (Coastal Carolina)
Ms. Jodie Herrin (USC Aiken)
Dr. Bob Isenhower (Spartanburg Tech)
Mr. Mac Kirkpatrick (Lander)
Dr. Carol Lancaster (MUSC)
Mr. Russell Long (USC Columbia)
Dr. Charles Parker (Midlands Tech)
Ms. Anna T. Strange (Central Carolina Tech)
Ms. Catherine Watt (Clemson)

I. Welcome and Introductory Remarks

Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong opened the meeting at 10:30 a.m. She welcomed the group and had an information packet for the meeting distributed. The packet included: (a) a meeting agenda, (b) a tentative schedule for the FY 2002-03 calendar for Planning and Assessment activity, (c) a schedule of applicable scored and monitored performance funding indicators as of June 2002, (d) Performance Funding Indicator 2A, Academic and Other Credentials of Faculty, (e) Performance Funding Indicator 3D, Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs, and (f) Performance Funding Indicator 7D, Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, Graduate, or Employment-Related Examinations and Certification Tests. ***(See Attachment 1 for a complete copy of the packet.)*** A CAPA membership list was also distributed. ***(See Attachment 2.)***

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong requested that someone volunteer to take the minutes because she would like to rotate that

responsibility through institutional representatives. However, since no one volunteered, Dr. Ulmer-Sottong assigned CHE staff member, Julie Wahl, to take these first minutes. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong stated for the next meeting that if there were no volunteers to take the meeting, she would select from the list. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong then proceeded through the agenda.

II. Committee Organizational Issues

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong indicated that the purpose (Agenda Item II.A) of the group was to work across sectors to deal with common issues related to performance funding and assessment. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong state that the membership list that had been distributed was a list of voting members. She expressed her hope that the group could usually come to consensus on issues, but noted that when this was not possible a vote of members might be needed. She indicated that CHE staff might have differences of opinion – not always agreeing with CAPA recommendations – in which case both recommendations might go forth to the Committee. She also stated that, at times, it might be helpful to have small groups of CAPA members working on issues that were particularly detailed or cumbersome, and then bring the results of those discussions to CAPA.

The calendar (Agenda Item II.C) presented in the information packet was discussed briefly. Representatives were informed that the dates for Planning and Assessment activity were not firm but were suggested so that members could begin to plan their calendars. It was suggested that CAPA meetings be quarterly meetings although it was recognized that the group might need to meet more frequently upfront depending on issues that arise. The CHE calendar and its availability on-line was then discussed briefly.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong had Ms.Carr distribute a 2-page handout. (*See Attachment 3.*) The handout presented some guiding principles and performance funding guidelines that Dr. Ulmer-Sottong reviewed in order to provide a starting framework for related discussions In terms of the structure of the CAPA meetings (Agenda Item II.B), Dr. Ulmer-Sottong also explained that the group should be more informal than formal, and that representatives or persons from the audience should feel free to provide input and discuss items on the agenda, since more rather than less input would provide stronger direction to the CHE staff and to the Planning and Assessment Committee that CAPA was formed to advise.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong then requested introductions of those in attendance including their name, title and/or responsibilities, institution or other affiliation, and information related to enrollment and size of their institution.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong spoke about the Divisional newsletter that had been sent out recently. She informed the group that it was now on the web in pdf format since not all could open it in the Publisher format.

Dr. Thomas Higerd then addressed the group indicating his desire for a meeting docket so that people can add issues to be discussed, and he requested that to that extent the following topics to be addressed: communication in general, “why we are here” and the dismissal time. It was stated that the Group would adjourn by 1:15 pm. Related to communication, he suggested that CHE staff put all files for meetings to include all Planning and Assessment meetings and other CHE mailouts in one continuous pdf file rather than sending an email with numerous attachments. Related discussion followed. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong said that when possible this group would use pdf for its mailouts. She also asked Dr. Mike Raley to check into the ease of using pdf files for all Planning and Assessment mailouts/communication distributions when attachments were required. Ms. Karen Jones requested that information be accessible in Excel format as well. Additional discussion followed related to suggestions for mailouts and posting of information.

Dr. Higerd addressed the group to request that the group establish the value of the Committee in terms of articulating “why we are here” and “what we anticipate getting out of the meeting.” He offered a list of four objectives including: addressing concerns from institutions and from CHE; allowing for cross-fertilization of issues across sectors; elevating academic concerns as the process tends to become political and bureaucratic; and improving inter-collegiate networking. He expressed his feeling that the more expectations we articulated, the better off the group would be.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong agreed with Dr. Higerd that we would not benefit if this group (CAPA) did not address issues between CHE and institutions. In response to concerns regarding academic issues, she reminded CAPA members that there was already an advisory group consisting of academic provosts as a part of CHE's Academic Affairs Committee and that this group, Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP), should be used much more than they have been to address academic concerns within performance funding. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong discussed with the group CHE's advocacy role. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong also described for CAPA the activities of the recently formed Strategic Planning and Implementation Committee. This Planning Committee consists of primarily Presidents (or Provosts) and has been formed to address common issues across institutions related to State level planning for higher education. She again stated her agreement that this group must be able to address issues between CHE and staff and expressed her appreciation of suggestions provided for improving communication.

Ms. Dorcas Kitchings requested additional information related to the timing of the newsletter sent out by the Planning, Assessment and Performance Funding Division. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong stated that the newsletter would usually follow a Planning and Assessment Committee meeting and would be available in pdf and Publisher 2000. Her intent was to use the newsletter as an additional means of communication, particularly for people who could not attend the Planning and Assessment meetings. She hoped the group would give her and CHE staff feedback if it was a useful addition to communication methods. She also discussed as a possibility for consideration of the group the creation of a similar newsletter for CAPA.

III. Discussion Items

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong requested that Ms. Julie Wahl review the information distributed earlier. Ms. Wahl reviewed the format of the schedule of indicators presented in the packet of information distributed earlier (Agenda Item III.A.) Ms. Wahl proceeded to review the information, cautioning that this was a draft schedule pulled together for discussion purposes only for this meeting. She requested that representatives contact her if questions or clarification is needed and informed the group that the information would be distributed at a later point to all performance funding contacts. Dr. Hunter requested clarification regarding monitored indicators and what data would be used. CHE staff addressed the issue discussing the process for monitoring would involve the best available data at the time of the review and reiterated that although the general process for conducting monitoring has been set forth the details for that process have yet to be determined. There was a brief discussion on this topic among institutional representatives and CHE staff. Dr. Harry Matthews requested clarification of the terminology being used in identifying institutions as "senior" and requested that actual sector designations be used. Ms. Wahl explained that the term was only being used as a shorthand reference to four-year institutions (research and teaching) and MUSC, but the "shorthand" would be discontinued and the specific sector would be designated in the future for this division.

Ms. Wahl then continued to review the information included in the schedules. Indicator 2D was discussed briefly in terms of issues related to the development of this year's standards across sectors. Members were informed that additional information would be forthcoming. Some in the group suggested that the group consider using last year's standards for 2D for all sectors since there was no increase in salaries provided. Members were informed that the data presented here would be refined and distributed to performance funding representatives. After the review of the information related to the scored and monitored performance indicators, Dr. Ulmer-Sottong then briefly reviewed each of the indicators, highlighting those areas that need to be addressed in the coming year in order to give the group a sense of issues that need to be considered by the group. Following her review, there was a short break.

Indicator 2A Discussion

After the break, the group reconvened and began discussion of Indicator 2A (Agenda Item III.B.) Dr. Ulmer-Sottong requested that Indicator 2A as it appears in the workbook be set aside for now so that the group could consider what parents and the public want to know and should know about the quality of the faculty teaching at our state institutions. A lengthy discussion ensued. The group pursued an exercise led by Dr. Ulmer-Sottong to

identify factors the members would want to know about the quality of the faculty teaching their sons or daughters. Highlights of items members of the group discussed as things they would want to know about a faculty member who was going to teach their sons/daughters are listed below.

- Is the faculty member full-time or part-time?
- How many courses in the freshman year are taught by temporary faculty?
- What is the course load of the faculty member?
- Is the faculty member teaching or doing research? (some CAPA members saw research as a positive in terms of classroom teaching; some as a negative – There was a difference in desirability of research involvement depending on upper or lower class courses.)
- Is the faculty member fluent in English?
- How many students is the faculty member teaching in a semester?
- How many preparations does the faculty member have?
- Does the faculty member meet SACS criteria?
- Does the faculty member teach the course or does a Graduate or Teaching Assistant teach?
- Is the faculty member a permanent employee (tenure track or non tenure track) of the institution?
- Does the faculty have recent experience in their field outside of the institution?

After a lengthy discussion related to the items highlighted above and the topic in general, Mr. David Fleming expressed his desire for the group to go back and consider the original intention of this indicator, indicating that he found it was meant to assess appropriate credentials, English fluency of faculty, and overall quality of faculty. He questioned whether we had picked the right measure of the quality of faculty indicating that only two performance indicators now address the issue – one for compensation and one for credentials.

Dr. Matthews asked if the group was in open discussion and requested to speak. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong stated that we were in open discussion and then expressed her concern regarding the indicator as to whether it addressed quality of faculty to explain her reason behind the exercise. Dr. Harry Matthews asked for clarification as to the reason the indicator was on the agenda. Dr. Matthews then reviewed, from his perspective, the history of the indicator in terms of the reason it was on the agenda. He stated that it was on the agenda because of a scoring appeal brought forth by the research sector. He explained the issue and expressed his belief that the issue should be a procedural one relating to the research sector since he believed the issue had been determined for their sector (i.e., that the sector believed instructors should be excluded given language indicating that 2A includes the same population used as a basis for Indicator 2D.) He stated that he was prepared to go through the 2A issues with a handout he had prepared. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong responded by indicating the issue for the research sector had not been determined. Dr. Matthews requested to finish his explanation of the issue and then could argue the case. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong interjected stating that she did not plan to argue the case, and Dr. Matthews asked “if not, then why were we here?” Dr. Ulmer-Sottong stated she was reopening the indicator (2A) as an indicator for all sectors. Dr. Matthews asked for a point of clarification as to what it was that CAPA was advising on as related to this indicator – pointing out that since there is a disagreement as to what the indicator currently measures it makes it difficult to advise on whether or not to keep the indicator.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong recognized there was a disagreement as to what the indicator measures and stated her position that from CHE perspective instructors were currently included in the indicator for all sectors. She stated that the disagreement on this point could be brought forth to the Commission, but believed, however, that what would be more helpful would be to get past the disagreement and, regardless of which way it is or is not currently defined, determine if the indicator is the best indicator it can be and is the one we want. Dr. Matthews stated he would not argue against that point and was glad it was raised. He stated that if the indicator is not the issue then the disagreement is a moot point. He stated that he was trying to set a starting point and thought everyone needed to know there is a difference of opinion as to what policy is at the moment. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong agreed that there is a difference of opinion and stated that at the last Planning and Assessment meeting the indicator was sent to the advisory committee (CAPA) to discuss. She stated that her question is whether the indicator is a good indicator.

In the discussion related to changing the indicator, Mr. Bob Mellon pointed out that if we are re-addressing the indicator, the academic folks need to be involved, and he would not be at liberty to discuss options without their involvement. Dr. David Loope agreed and indicated that he assumed that the issues for this indicator would involve Academic Affairs committees. Discussion related to involvement of the CHE Academic Affairs committees continued. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong stated she agreed with obtaining input from the academic side and reiterated that we have an opportunity to determine what it is we need to know regarding what the indicator is measuring. Mr. Mellon questioned whether this was a sector specific issue and discussed procedural concerns related to involving the Academic Affairs committees. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong again indicated that we have an opportunity to re-address the indicator and to include input from the academic side. She also stated that she did not mean to indicate that there isn't a disagreement with the research sector as to what the definition is, but wanted to get past this issue and re-examine the indicator. Dr. Higerd addressed Mr. Mellon's question by explaining that the disagreement about 2A was a sector issue and then expressed his thought that the core issue is how you count faculty. He explained concerns around the characterization of instructors for the sector. He stated too that the legislation indicates "instructors" in the generic sense to be inclusive of all institutions and indicated that the issue for the research sector is that the characteristics of the instructors is different for their sector.

Discussion followed related to where instructors were included and the affect as related to the indicator. Dr. Higerd noted that the issue was not related to scoring but to a philosophical issue of how the instructors should be counted. During the discussion, Ms. Catherine Watt indicated that the three institutions use the instructor very differently from others. Ms. Jodi Herrin stated that was true in the teaching sector as well, and it is also an issue for them. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong expressed her concern that once instructors were pulled out then there really wouldn't be an indicator because all institutions would get automatically get "3's." After additional discussion, Dr. Ulmer-Sottong reiterated that the issue here is how to define faculty. Discussion ensued related to the treatment of instructors across all measures and the MRR. Ms. Michelle Smith stated that if the issue is one of whether the indicator is measuring quality issues in the state regarding faculty then it should be sent to Academic Affairs for consideration. CHE staff indicated that is where staff started.

Dr. Fleming suggested that participants think about the issue and come back later to discuss it with possible proposals of change. A few of those present expressed concerns related to timing and the ability to get the appropriate people on campuses involved. There was discussion of timing as related to ACAP and Academic Affairs' schedules. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong reiterated her commitment to include other areas of the Commission and institutions when involvement in those areas is warranted. She stated that for this indicator the provosts need to have input in this issues. Additional discussion followed.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong requested that Ms. Carr distribute a data packet related to the issues being discussed. (*See Attachment 4.*) Mr. Long expressed his concerns regarding the issue as one of principle in that the research sector finds that the workbook in this instance says one thing and another is measured. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong reiterated her belief that the issue was a "true misunderstanding" of what the language says and how it should be interpreted. Additional discussion followed. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong stated that she wanted to get past the misunderstanding and again suggested re-considering the indicator. Mr. Long and others requested clarification about what we are considering for Year 7 or 8. Related discussion followed in which it was stated that it would depend on what the group comes back with at the next meeting in terms of what to do with the indicator. Ms. Star Kepner requested clarification for regional campuses on the issue of instructors and staff provided clarification and their perspective on the issue indicating that instructors are included on both 2A (faculty credentials) and 2D (compensation) for regional campuses.

Ms. Karen Jones noted the time stating that there are 2 apparent major issues – what the research sector believes and how to measure the indicator for Year 7. She stated that the other question is whether we are evaluating the indicator overall and requested given the time that the group might wish to consider the calendar and agenda of the next meeting. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong indicated that timing related to how the indicator would apply would depend on what is proposed and suggested representatives talk to provosts about the indicator in regard to what should be considered when measuring the quality of faculty on campuses. Dr. Loope reminded everyone to be mindful of the timeframe surrounding meetings of the academic provosts since he assumed the issue would

receive their consideration. Dr. Higerd pointed out that in the research sector the provosts have been a part of discussions and they all have the same thinking around the issue and that we have to be mindful of issues related to “one-size-fits all” in our considerations indicating that consideration of separate sectors is key. He explained his views relating that the research sector currently finds the issue at hand as a sector specific one related to how only the research sector considers instructors. Additional discussion related to involvement of the provosts and timeframes followed. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong reiterated that performance funding issues will be discussed with other divisions as applicable and as such we would be seeking the input of the academic side. Mr. Long suggested that in order to get the issue off the table that the group might consider looking at a new indicator.

Concerns were discussed related to the timing and impact on the upcoming year. Next meeting dates were discussed. As they were discussed, Ms. Wahl explained the data that related to Indicator 2A that had been already distributed earlier. She explained that it was intended as review for purposes at this meeting in considering the indicator. *(See Attachment 4.)* She cautioned that the tables and charts were for discussion purposes only and that complete descriptions of data calculations were not necessarily included. Those receiving the data were asked to call Ms. Wahl if additional clarification was needed.

CAPA’s next meeting was scheduled for July 8, 2002, beginning at 9:30 am ending no later than noon. Ms. Brown graciously agreed to re-schedule the upcoming ACIR (Advisory Committee on Institutional Research) for the afternoon of July 8 since many attending CAPA also attend ACIR. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong indicated that at the next meeting there would be continued discussion on Performance Indicator 2A and that information related to legislative changes affecting institutional effectiveness reporting and “regulatory relief” would be also discussed. Mr. Long requested that handouts be provided prior to the meeting. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong indicated that when possible hand-outs would be provided; however, she also noted that this might not always be possible depending on the issues and schedules. Following a brief discussion related to the upcoming meeting and issues surrounding the voting by members, Dr. Ulmer-Sottong thanked those in attendance.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

NOTE: Because of the nature of the issues discussed, the minutes for this meeting are more inclusive than normally expected in order to aid in future discussions. Main points of speakers around which conversation of the group centered are reflected. In order to assure the minutes reflect the specific conversation in this summarized format, the minutes were developed based on meeting notes of the recording secretary and other staff present at the meeting and based on a review of the audio tape made of the meeting. The minutes were also reviewed and edited by Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong.

ATTACHMENTS referenced in minutes are available upon request. Please note that the format of the attachments in terms of headers, footers and page numbers may vary from those distributed at the meeting. The materials were formatted for electronic distribution following the meeting. The materials as formatted electronically are attached. The content of the attached materials are the same as those distributed at the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,



Ms. Julie C. Wahl
Recording Secretary for the first CAPA meeting